

A Note on the Solvability of Groups *

Shiheng Li and Wujie Shi

(School of Mathematic Science, Suzhou University, Suzhou 215006, Peoples Republic of China)

Abstract

Let M be a maximal subgroup of a finite group G and K/L be a chief factor such that $L \leq M$ while $K \not\leq M$. We call the group $M \cap K/L$ a c -section of M . And we define $Sec(M)$ to be the abstract group that is isomorphic to a c -section of M . For every maximal subgroup M of G , assume that $Sec(M)$ is supersolvable. Then any composition factor of G is isomorphic to $L_2(p)$ or Z_q , where p and q are primes, and $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$. This result answer a question posed by ref. [12].

Keywords. finite group, c -section, maximal subgroup.

In [12] the following question was posed:

Question. For every maximal subgroup M of a group G assume that $Sec(M)$ is supersolvable. Is G solvable?

For solving this Question we need some definitions and lemmas.

Definition 1[12, Definition 1.1]. Let M be a maximal subgroup of a finite group G and K/L be a chief factor such that $L \leq M$ while $K \not\leq M$. We call the group $M \cap K/L$ a c -section of M .

We say that there is a unique class of subgroups U in a group G , if every subgroup isomorphic to U is conjugate to U in G .

Lemma 1[12, Lemma 1.1]. For any maximal subgroup M of a group G , there is a unique c -section of M up to isomorphism.

By Lemma 1, it is reasonable to introduce the following:

Definition 2[12, Definition 1.2(1)]. Given a maximal subgroup M of a group G , we define $Sec(M)$ as the abstract group that is isomorphic to a c -section of M .

Similar to the proof of [5, II, 5.3(a)] and of (1) in the proof of [5, II, 5.3(b)], we get Lemma 2.

Lemma 2. (a) For $n \neq 4$, $1 < k < n$, A_n has no subgroup of index k .

(b) For every subgroup U of index n in A_n , there exists an automorphism α of A_n such that $U^\alpha = V_1$, where $V_1 = \{g \in A_n \mid 1^g = 1\} \cong A_{n-1}$.

*Project supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China.

Lemma 3. If $n \neq 6$, the subgroups of index n in alternative group A_n are conjugate in A_n .

Proof. Since $n \neq 6$, by [5, II,5.5(a) and 5.3(b)] there exist n subgroups of index n in S_n and they are conjugate in S_n . Let U is a subgroup in A_n of index n . Since $\text{Aut}(A_n) \cong S_n$ ($n \neq 6$) and A_n ($n \neq 4$) is simple, $N_{S_n}(U) \cong S_{n-1}$ is a subgroup of S_n of index n by Lemma 2(b). Moreover S_{n-1} has only one subgroup of index 2. Thus there exactly exist n subgroups of index n in A_n . Then these subgroups are conjugate in A_n .

The following example gives a negative answer for the above Question.

Example Groups

$$G := PGL_2(p)$$

are the counterexamples of the Question, where $p \in \mathbb{P}$ and $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$.

Proof In the following, p is always a prime with $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$. Let $G = PGL_2(p)$, $K = L_2(p)$. We know that $G = K \langle \alpha \rangle$, where α is an outer automorphism of order 2 of K .

By [5, II,8.16], K has two conjugacy classes of elementary abelian subgroups T of type $(2, 2)$ and $|N_K(T)| = 24$. By [5, II,8.27], $PGL_2(p)$ is contained in $L_2(p^2) =: F$, then $N_K(T) \leq N_G(T) \leq N_F(T)$. Thus, $|N_G(T)| = 24$ since $|N_F(T)| = 24$ by [5, II,8.16] again. It follows that $|G : N_G(T)| = 2|K : N_K(T)|$, then all the elementary abelian subgroups of type $(2, 2)$ in K are conjugate in G . Therefore, $\alpha \in G \setminus K$ interchanges the two conjugacy classes of elementary abelian subgroups of type $(2, 2)$ in $L_2(p)$. Especially, T^α and T can't be conjugate in K .

Evidently, $G \triangleright K \triangleright 1$ is the unique chief series of G . Let M be a maximal subgroup of G (denoted $M < \cdot G$). If $M = K$, then $\text{Sec}(M) = 1$. So we may assume $K \not\leq M$. Then $\text{Sec}(M) = K \cap M$ and $G = KM$. Hence, there exist elements $k \in K$ and $m \in M$ such that $\alpha = km$. Then T^m and T cannot be conjugate in K .

By [5, II,8.27], the maximal subgroups of K are isomorphic to S_4 , A_5 , or supersolvable. Hence, if $\text{Sec}(M)$ is not supersolvable, then $\text{Sec}(M)$ is isomorphic to S_4 , A_5 , or A_4 . Assume that $T \leq \text{Sec}(M)$, then $\langle T, T^m \rangle \leq K \cap M = \text{Sec}(M)$. On the other hand, all elementary abelian subgroups T of type $(2, 2)$ in A_5 , S_4 , or A_4 are conjugate in them respectively. Then T^m and T are conjugate in K , a contradiction.

Therefore, $\text{Sec}(M)$ is supersolvable for each $M < \cdot G$.

Now, we give a complete answer to the Question:

Theorem. Let G be a finite group. For every maximal subgroup M of G , assume that $\text{Sec}(M)$ is supersolvable. Then any composition factor of G is isomorphic to $L_2(p)$ or Z_q , where p and q are primes, and $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$.

We need the following lemma.

Lemma 4. Suppose that $G = SL(n, p^f)$, $f > 1$ and $P \in \text{Syl}_p(G)$. Let $L = L_n(p)$ and $P_1 \in \text{Syl}_p(L)$. Then $N_G(P)$ and $N_L(P_1)$ are non-supersolvable.

Proof. By [5, II,7.1], we may assume that P consists of the following matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & a_{n-1,3} & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & a_{n,3} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the normalizer of P in G is consists of the following matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & a_{n-1,3} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & a_{n,3} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $a_{11}a_{22}\cdots a_{n,n} = 1$.

Let $E = \text{diag}\{1, 1, \cdots, 1\}$ and $D \in N_G(P)$. Let E_{ij} be a matrix having a lone 1 as its (i, j) -entry and all other entries 0, where $i \neq j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (D)^{-1}(E + aE_{n,1})D \\ = & E + aD^{-1}E_{n,1}D \\ = & E + a \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & a_{n-1,3} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & a_{n,3} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} E_{n,1} \\ & \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & a_{n-1,3} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & a_{n,3} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} \\ = & E + a \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^{-1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a'_{21} & a_{22}^{-1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a'_{n-1,1} & a'_{n-1,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1}^{-1} & 0 \\ a'_{n,1} & a'_{n,2} & \cdots & a'_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{n,1} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= E + aa_{n,n}^{-1} E_{n,1} \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ a_{n-1,1} & a_{n-1,2} & \cdots & a_{n-1,n-1} & 0 \\ a_{n,1} & a_{n,2} & \cdots & a_{n,n-1} & a_{n,n} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= E + aa_{n,n}^{-1} a_{11} E_{n,1}.
\end{aligned}$$

And it is evident that $N = \{E + aE_{n,1} | a \in GF(p^f)\}$ is a subgroup of the group of all matrices of n rank with respect to matrix multiplication. Hence N is a normal subgroup of $N_G(P)$.

In case $n > 2$, we can get that $a_{n,n} = 1$. Thus, if $a \neq 0$ then $aa_{n,n}^{-1}a_{11} = aa_{11}$ runs over $GF(p^f)$ when a_{11} runs over $GF(p^f)$. Therefore N is a minimal normal subgroup of $N_G(P)$. If $n = 2$, then $a_{n,n}^{-1} = a_{11}$. Thus $aa_{n,n}^{-1}a_{11} = aa_{11}^2$. It follows that $|\{aa_{11}^2 | a_{11} \in GF(p^f)\}| \geq p^f - 1$ if $p = 2$ and $|\{aa_{11}^2 | a_{11} \in GF(p^f)\}| = \frac{p^f-1}{2}$ if p is odd for $a \neq 0$. Then N is also a minimal normal subgroup of $N_G(P)$ when $n = 2$ since $|N| = p^f$. Therefore, $N_G(P)$ is not supersolvable for $f > 1$.

Since $L \cong G/Z(G)$ and $P \cong P_1$, similar to above, we also have that $N_L(P_1)$ is not supersolvable for $f > 1$.

Proof of the Theorem. Suppose that the Theorem is false. Then there exists a minimal counterexample. Let G be a minimal counterexample.

(1) G has the unique minimal normal subgroup N and $N \cong N_1 \times N_2 \times \cdots \times N_t$, where $N_1 \cong \cdots \cong N_t$ is a non-abelian simple group.

By Lemma 1, $Sec(M/N)$ is supersolvable for every normal subgroup M/N of G/N , thus G/N satisfies the hypotheses of the Theorem. Hence any composition factor of G/N is isomorphic to $L_2(p)$ or Z_q . Thus G has the unique minimal normal subgroup N since any composition factor of $G/L \cap K$ is isomorphic to a composition factor of G/K or G/L , where K and L are normal subgroup of G . And N is non-abelian since G is a minimal counterexample. Therefore, $N \cong N_1 \times N_2 \times \cdots \times N_t$, where $N_1 \cong \cdots \cong N_t$ is non-abelian simple group.

(2) Without loss of generality, we may assume that $G \cong Aut(N_1)$, $N = Soc(G)$.

By [3, 18.14], G might be considered as a subgroup $Inn(G)$ (the inner automorphism group of N) of $Aut(N) \cong Aut(N_1) \wr_{nat} S_n$. Let M_1 be a maximal subgroup of $Aut(N_1)$ such that $N_1 \not\leq M_1$, then $Aut(N) = N(M_1 \wr_{nat} S_n)$ and $N \not\leq M_1 \wr_{nat} S_n$. Thus $G = G \cap Aut(N) = N(G \cap (M_1 \wr_{nat} S_n))$ and G has a maximal subgroup M that contains $G \cap (M_1 \wr_{nat} S_n)$. Hence $G = MN$ and $N \not\leq M$. Then $Sec(M) = M \cap N \geq G \cap (M_1 \wr_{nat} S_n) \cap N \geq N_1 \cap M_1$. By the hypothesis of the theorem, $Sec(M)$ is supersolvable and thus $N_1 \cap M_1$ is supersolvable. Hence $Aut(N_1)$ satisfies the hypothesis of

the theorem. On the other hand, since $Aut(N_1)/N_1$ is solvable by Schreier conjecture and G/N satisfies the Theorem, any composition of G is isomorphic to $L_2(p)$, Z_q , or N_1 , where $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$ and $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$.

Hence, if G is a counterexample of the Theorem then $Aut(N_1)$ is also a counterexample of the Theorem; if G isn't a counterexample of the Theorem then $Aut(N_1)$ isn't a counterexample of the Theorem. Therefore, we may assume that $G \cong Aut(N_1)$ and $N = N_1$.

In the following, $G \cong Aut(N_1)$, $N = Soc(G)$.

(3) Every maximal subgroup M of G such that $N \not\leq M$ is soluble. And $N \cap M = Sec(M)$ is supersolvable.

Since $M/Sec(M) \cong MN/N = G/N$ is soluble and $Sec(M)$ is supersolvable by the hypothesis of the Theorem, then M is soluble.

Evidently, by (3) we get (4):

(4) If there is a proper subgroup H of G such that $HN = G$, then H is soluble and $H \cap N$ is supersolvable.

(5) Let $1 \neq U$ be a proper subgroup of N . If there is a unique class of subgroups U in N then U is supersolvable.

Set

$$\Gamma := \{U^n | n \in N\}.$$

Since there is a unique class of subgroups U in N , both G and N transitively act on Γ by conjugation. Therefore, $G = N_G(U)N$ by Frattini Argument. Then, by (4) $N_G(U)$ is soluble and $U \leq N_G(U) \cap N$ is supersolvable.

We analyse it case by case:

Case(A) $N = A_n$, $n \geq 5$. If $n \neq 6$ then $G = S_n$. Evidently, both G and N act on $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ transitively, by Frattini argument, $G = NS_{n-1}$. Thus, by (4), $A_{n-1} = N \cap S_{n-1}$ is supersolvable, a contradiction. If $n = 6$, from [2], G doesn't satisfy the hypothesis of the Theorem by (3).

Case(B) $N = L_2(q)$, $q = p^f > 3$. If $f > 1$, then $N_G(P)$ is not supersolvable by Lemma 4. If $p^2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{16}$, i.e. $p \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$, then there is a unique class of subgroups A_4 in $L_2(p)$. Thus $N \not\cong L_2(q)$, $f > 1$, or $f = 1$ and $p \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$ by (5). On the other hand, by Example, G satisfies the Theorem if $N \cong L_2(p)$, $p \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8}$.

Case(C) $N = L_n(q)$, $n > 2$. Since $L_3(2) \cong L_2(7)$, we suppose $(n, q) \neq (3, 2)$. By [1, 13.2], $G = N_G(M)PGL_n(q) = N_G(M)L_n(q)$, where we choose $M \cong PGL_1(q) \times PGL_{n-1}(q)$. Evidently $M \cap N$ has a section isomorphic to $L_{n-1}(q)$. But by (4) $M \cap N \leq N_G(M) \cap N$ is supersolvable. Then $(n, q) = (3, 2)$.

Case(D) $N = U_n(q)$, $n \geq 3$. Since $G \leq P\Gamma L_n(q)$, both G and $U_n(q)$ transitively act on the set of nonsingular subspaces of dimension i by Witt's theorem. Define N_i to be the stabilizer of a nonsingular space of dimension i in G . Then $G = N_1N$ by Frattini argument and thus N_1 is soluble. On the other hand, both N_1 and $N_1 \cap N$ have a section isomorphic to $U_{n-1}(q)$. Then $(n, q) = (3, 2)$ by (4). If $N = U_3(2)$, G does not satisfy the hypothesis by [2].

Case(E) $N = PSp_4(q)$, $q = 2^f > 2$. Let $P \in Syl_2(N)$. From [1, §14], there is

a $M < \cdot G$ such that $M \cap L = N_N(P)$. By (3), $N_N(P)$ is supersolvable and then $N_N(P) = P \times H$, where H is a 2-complement of $N_N(P)$. From [9, 5.1.7(b)], we get that $|N_N(P)| = q^4(q-1)^2$. So $|H| = (q-1)^2$. Let r is the largest prime divisor of $|H|$ and $R \in \text{Syl}_r(H)$. Then $PR = P \times R$ is a nilpotent Hall $\{2, r\}$ -subgroup of N . By [5, II, 9.24, b)], we can consider $PSp_2(q^2)$ as a subgroup of N . Let $T = PSp_2(q^2)$ and $P_1 \in \text{Syl}_2(T)$, $R_1 \in \text{Syl}_r(T)$. Since $|N| = q^4(q+1)^2(q-1)^2(q^2+1)$ and $|T| = q^2(q-1)(q+1)(q^2+1)$, from [13], we may assume that $P_1R_1 \leq PR$. Thus $C_T(P_1) \geq R_1 > 1$, contrary to $C_T(P_1) = 1$.

Case(F) $N = PSp_{2m}(q)$, $m > 2$ or $m = 2$ and q odd. Then $G \leq P\Gamma L_n(q)$. Both G and $U_n(q)$ transitively act on the set of totally singular i -subspaces for each i by Witt's theorem. Define P_i to be the stabilizer of a totally singular i -space in G . Then $G = P_1N$ by Frattini argument. On the other hand, both P_1 and $P_1 \cap N$ have a section isomorphic to $PSp_{2(m-1)}(q)$. Then $PSp_{2(m-1)}(q)$ is soluble by (4), a contradiction.

Case(G) $N = P\Omega_{2m+1}(q)$, $m \geq 3$, q odd. Define N_i to be the stabilizer of a nonsingular space of dimension i in G . Similar to Case $N = U_n(q)$, $n \geq 3$, we get that N_1 is soluble and N_1 has a section isomorphic to $P\Omega_{2m}^+(q)$ or $P\Omega_{2m}^-(q)$, a contradiction.

Case(H) $N = P\Omega_8^+(q)$. By [6, Proposition 2.2.1], there is a unique class of subgroups R_1 in N , where R_1 to be the stabilizer of a totally singular 1-space in N . Then R_1 is supersolvable by (5) but R_1 has a section isomorphic to $P\Omega_6^+(q)$, a contradiction.

Case(I) $N = P\Omega_{2m}^+(q)$, $m > 4$. Then $G \leq P\Gamma L_n(q)$. Both G and N transitively act on the set of totally singular i -subspaces for each i by Witt's theorem. Define P_i to be the stabilizer of a totally singular i -space in G . Then $G = P_2N$ by Frattini argument. On the other hand, P_2 has a section isomorphic to $P\Omega_{2(m-1)}^+(q)$. Then $PSp_{2(m-1)}(q)$ is soluble by (4), a contradiction.

Case(J) $N = P\Omega_{2m}^-(q)$, $m \geq 4$. Similar to Case $N = P\Omega_{2m}^+(q)$, $m > 4$.

Case(K) N is an exceptional group of Lie type:

Subcase(a) $N = {}^2B_2(q)$, $q = 2^{2m+1}$. Let $P \in \text{Syl}_p(N)$. From [11], we know that $N_N(P)$ is a Frobenius group of order $2^{2(2m+1)}(2^{2m+1} - 1)$ and $N_N(P)$ is supersolvable by (5), a contradiction.

Subcase(b) $N = {}^2G_2(q)$, $q = 3^{2m+1}$. In this case the Sylow 2-subgroup P of N is abelian. In addition, $N_N(P)$ is supersolvable by (5). Thus $N_N(p) = C_N(P)$. Hence N is 2-nilpotent by the well-known theorem of Burnside and then N is soluble by the odd order theorem, a contradiction.

Subcase(c) $N = G_2(q)$. From [8, Table 1], there is a unique class of subgroups $SL_3(q)$ in $G_2(q)$ if $3 \nmid q$; there is a unique class of subgroups ${}^2G_2(q)$ in $G_2(q)$ if $q = 3^{2m+1}$; there is a unique class of subgroups $G_2(q^m)$ in $G_2(q)$ if $q = 3^{2m}$, which contradicts (5).

Subcase(d) $N = {}^3D_4(q)$. From [8, Table 1], there is a unique class of subgroups $G_2(q)$ in N , which contradicts (5).

Subcase(e) $N = {}^2F_4(q)$, $q = 2^{2m+1} > 2$, or ${}^2F_4(2)'$. If $N = {}^2F_4(2)'$, from [2], we get that G does not satisfy the hypothesis by (3). If $N = {}^2F_4(q)$, $q = 2^{2m+1} > 2$, by [10, Proposition 2.12], there is just one class of subgroups $L_2(25)$ in N . Hence $L_2(25)$ is supersolvable by (5), a contradiction.

Subcase(f) $N = F_4(q)$. If q is odd, from [8, Table 1], there is a unique conjugacy

class of subgroups $B_4(q)$ in $G_2(q)$. If $q = 2^m$, by [4, 2.8, 2.9, and 2.11], $N_N(S) = SH$ is a group of order $q^{24}(q-1)^4$ and $C_H(S) = 1$, where $S \in \text{Syl}_2(N)$ and $|H| = (q-1)^4$. However, by (5), $N_N(S)$ is supersolvable and thus 2-nilpotent. Then $N_N(S) = S \times H$, contrary to $C_H(S) = 1$ when $q > 2$. When $q = 2$, from [2], we get that G can't satisfy the hypotheses by (3).

Subcase(g) $N = {}^2E_6(q), E_6(q), E_7(q)$ or $E_8(q)$. In this case, there is a unique class of non-soluble subgroups in N by [8, Proposition 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1], which contradicts (5).

Case(L) N is a sporadic simple groups.

If the outer automorphism group $\text{Out}(N) = 1$, then $G = N$ cannot satisfy the hypothesis by [5, VI, 9.6]. Hence, we only consider the sporadic simple groups N such that $\text{Out}(N) = 2$ since $|G/N| \leq 2$ and then, from [2], we get that G does not satisfy the hypothesis by (3).

Therefore the minimal counterexample is not existence and the theorem is proved.

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to Profs. Shirong Li and Xianhua Li for their helps. The authors are also grateful to the referee for his suggestions.

References

- [1] M. Aschbacher, On the maximal subgroups of the finite classical groups, *Invent. Math.*, 76, 469-514(1984).
- [2] J.H. Conway, S.P. Norton, R.A. Parker and R.A. Wilson, *Atlas of finite groups*, Oxford Univ. Press(Clarendon), Oxford and New York, 1985.
- [3] K. Doerk, T. Hawkes, *Finite Soluble Groups*, Walter de Gruyter.Berlin.New York, 1992.
- [4] Martin M. Guterman, A characterization of the groups $F_4(2^n)$, *J. Algebra*, 20, 1-23(1972).
- [5] B. Huppert, *Endliche Gruppen I*, Springer-verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, New York, 1979.
- [6] P.B. Kleidman, The maximal subgroups of the finite 8-Dimensional orthogonal Groups $P\Omega_8^+(q)$ and of their automorphism groups, *J. Algebra*, 110, 173-242(1987).
- [7] P. Kleidman, M. Liebeck, *The Subgroup structure of the Finite Classical Groups*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1990.
- [8] M.W. Liebeck, J. Saxl, On the orders of maximal subgroups of the finite exceptional groups of Lie type, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, (3)55(1987), 299-330.

- [9] M.W. Liebeck, C.E. Praeger, J. Saxl, The maximal factorizations of the finite simple groups and their automorphism groups, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., 86, No.432(1990).
- [10] G. Malle, The maximal subgroups of ${}^2F_4(q^2)$, J. Algebra 139,52-69(1991).
- [11] M. Suzuki, On a class of doubly transitive groups, Ann. of Math., 75(1962), 105-145.
- [12] Yanming Wang and Shirong Li, c-Sections of Maximal Subgroups of Finite Groups, J. Algebra, 229, 86-94(2000).
- [13] H. Wielandt, Zum Satz von Sylow II, Math. Z., 71(1959), 461–462.